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Introduction

- Concealed Information Test (CIT) is scientifically recognized to be a valid and reliable method in laboratory research.
- CIT has not been utilized in the field, except Japan.

Why?

CIT has been considered there are extraordinary gaps and few connections between laboratory research and the field application.

Aim:
To demonstrate whether or not there are gaps and connections between laboratory and the field.
Daily application in Japan

- About 100 polygraph examiners conduct approximately 5,000 examinations annually.
- These examinations conduct for almost all kinds of crimes.

Fig.1. The number of examination in last decade in Japan

Fig.2. Fraction separated by different crimes (2009)
What would be the gaps?

Laboratory experiment and the field examination could be different in...

1. Encoding situation
   - Simple task vs. Real action

2. Retrieving situation
   - Experiment vs. Real life setting
1. Encoding situations could be a vital gap?

(1) Comparing Card test with mock crime in laboratory experiment

- Experiment card test
- vs.
- Experiment mock crime

(2) Comparing Card test with real crime in the field examination

- Examination card test
- vs.
- Examination real crime
2. Retrieving situations could be a vital gap?

(3) Comparing mock crime in laboratory experiment with real crime in the field examination

Experiment mock crime vs. Examination real crime

→ With these 3 comparisons, gap and connection between laboratory research and the field application are investigated.
(1) Card vs. Mock crime in Exp.

- Participants:
  16 police members (9 male, 7 female; 28.4 yrs)
- Indices:
  respiratory speed (RS), skin conductance response (SCR), heart rate (HR), normalized pulse volume (NPV)
- Procedure:

Mock crime task → Card test → CIT for mock crime
In another room, participants stole $10,000$ from:
- Bag
- Jacket
- Notebook
- Box
- Basket

Participants picked one card out of five and memorized the number.

Is the number...
- 3 ?
- 4 ?
- 5 ?
- 6 ?
- 7 ?

Did you steal $10,000$ from...
- Bag ?
- Jacket ?
- Notebook ?
- Box ?
- Basket ?
(1) Results

Respiratory speed (RS)

T-TESTS
- card: critical < non-critical
- mock: critical < non-critical

ANOVA
Task (card / mock crime) x Item (critical / non-critical)
- Main effect of Item: critical < non-critical (p < .01)

Skin conductance response (SCR)

T-TESTS
- card: critical > non-critical
- mock: critical > non-critical

ANOVA
Task (card / mock crime) x Item (critical / non-critical)
- Main effect of Item: critical > non-critical (p < .001)
(1) Results

Heart rate (HR)
ANOVA
Item (cri / non-cri) x Block (0- / 5- / 10- / 15- sec)
card: critical < non-critical at 2-4
mock: critical < non-critical at 2-4

ANOVA
Task (card / mock crime) x Item x Block
Interaction of Item x Block:
critical < non-critical at 2-4 \( (p < .001) \)

Normalized pulse volume (NPV)
ANOVA
Item (cri / non-cri) x Block (0- / 5- / 10- / 15- sec)
card: critical < non-critical at 2-4
mock: critical < non-critical, 1 > 2-3

ANOVA
Task (card / mock crime) x Item x Block
Interaction of Item x Block:
critical < non-critical at 2-4 \( (p < .01) \)
(2) Card vs. Real crime in Exam.

- Participants:
  16 guilty persons (16 male, 0 female; 31.2 yrs)

- Indices:
  respiratory speed (RS),
  skin conductance response (SCR), heart rate (HR),
  normalized pulse volume (NPV)

- Procedure:
  - Card test
  - Polygraph examination
  - CIT for real crime
  - Real crime
Various crimes occurred in 2009 and 2010, in Hyogo pref. ex. theft, hit and run, indecent assault, snatch, molester, cultivation of hemp, injury etc.

The same procedure as experiment.

Card test was always conducted before questions of the crime to make participants understand the CIT procedure.

One question confirmed that examinee recognized critical item after examination was chosen.
(2) Results

Respiratory speed (RS)

T-TESTS
- card: critical < non-critical
- real: critical < non-critical

ANOVA
Task (card / real crime) x Item (critical / non-critical)
- Main effect of Item:
  - critical < non-critical (p < .001)

Skin conductance response (SCR)

T-TESTS
- card: critical > non-critical
- real: critical > non-critical

ANOVA
Task (card / real crime) x Item (critical / non-critical)
- Main effect of Item:
  - critical > non-critical (p < .001)
(2) Results

**Heart rate (HR)**

ANOVA
Item (cri / non-cri) x Block (0- / 5- / 10- / 15- sec)
card: critical < non-critical at 2-4
real: critical < non-critical at 2-4

ANOVA
Task (card / mock crime) x Item x Block
Interaction of Item x Block:
critical < non-critical at 2-4 ($p < .001$)

**Normalized pulse volume (NPV)**

ANOVA
Item (cri / non-cri) x Block (0- / 5- / 10- / 15- sec)
card: critical < non-critical, 1 > 2-3
real: critical < non-critical, 1 > 2-4

ANOVA
Task (card / mock crime) x Item x Block
Main effect of Item, Block ($p < .05$)
Interaction of Task x Block ($p < .01$)
(3) Mock crime vs. Real crime

- **Participants:**
  - mock crime group: 16 police members
  - real crime group: 16 guilty persons

- **Indices:**
  - respiratory speed (RS),
  - skin conductance response (SCR), heart rate (HR),
  - normalized pulse volume (NPV)
(3) Results

Respiratory speed (RS)

T-TESTS
mock: critical < non-critical
real: critical < non-critical

ANOVA
Group (mock / real crime) x Item (critical / non-critical)
Main effect of Item:
critical < non-critical (p < .001)

Skin conductance response (SCR)

T-TESTS
mock: critical > non-critical
real: critical > non-critical

ANOVA
Group (mock / real crime) x Item (critical / non-critical)
Main effect of Item:
critical > non-critical (p < .01)
(3) Results

Heart rate (HR)

ANOVA
Item (cri / non-cri) x Block (0- / 5- / 10- / 15- sec)
mock: critical < non-critical at 2-4
real: critical = non-critical at 2-4

ANOVA
Group (mock / real crime) x Item x Block
Interaction of Item x Block:
critical < non-critical at 2-4 (p < .001)

Normalized pulse volume (NPV)

ANOVA
Item (cri / non-cri) x Block (0- / 5- / 10- / 15- sec)
mock: critical < non-critical, 1 > 2-3
real: critical < non-critical, 1 > 2-4

ANOVA
Group (mock / real crime) x Item x Block
Interaction of Item x Block:
critical < non-critical at 2-4 (p < .05)
Under all conditions, the same responding patterns were shown.
Under all conditions, the differences between critical item and non-critical items were significant.
There was no difference among these conditions.

→ There is no essential gap which possibly denies the detection ability of the CIT.
There would be some factors raising the arousal level and increasing the difference between critical item and non-critical items in the field examination.
These factors are to increase the difference between critical and non-critical, but they won’t be the factors to make essential gaps between laboratory research and the field application.
Expectation to laboratory research

- Only in laboratory research these plus factors can be controlled.
- By systematically probing how these factors effect on the CIT, the mechanism of the CIT should be made clearer.

Conclusions:

- Working together more closely!
- No essential gap and direct and strong connection!
Thank you for your attention!
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